STAFF USE ONLY

PROJECT NUMBER: *99-077*
CASES: *RENVT200400028; ROAKT200400029; TR52909; CUP*

*** * * * INITIAL STUDY * * * ***
COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES
DEPARTMENT OF REGIONAL PLANNING
GENERAL INFORMATION

I.A. Map Date: *April 8, 2004* Staff Member: *Christina D. Tran*

Thomas Guide: *558 E-F 5 & 6* USGS Quad: *Calabasas*

Location: *Northeast of Liberty Canyon Road at Canwood Street; North of Ventura Freeway (Hwy. 101), one half mile west from the Lost Hills Roads interchange (between Lost Hills Road and Liberty Canyon Road)*

Description of Project: *Application for TR 52909 to develop 23 single family residences with lot sizes ranging from 87,120 s.f. to 168,021 s.f. The single-family residences will be located in the central portion of the 161.17 acre project site, approximately following the lowest relief. Proposed primary vehicular access will be from Canwood St. at Liberty Canyon Road. The new emergency second means of access will connect to De Berry Dr. to the east. The proposed grading which will be balanced onsite will affect approximately 53.2 acres and will involve approximately 800,000 c.y. including the offsite grading to connect the primary access road to Canwood Street. Project will connect to existing water and sewer lines to the adjacent subdivision to the east. Application also includes a request for an OTP for the encroachment of four oak trees (# 10, 12, 13, and 14 which is a heritage oak); a CUP for grading exceeding 100,000 c.y. and possibly a CUP for Hillside Management upon additional review of slope analysis.*

Gross Acres: *161.17 acres*

Environmental Setting: *Project site is located immediately north of the U.S. Freeway 101 between Lost Hills Road and Liberty Canyon within the Santa Monica Mountains North Area Plan area. The site is bordered to the east by a residential community (Saratoga Hills); to the north by the Calabasas Sanitary Landfill; to the west by open space that is a wildlife movement corridor owned by the Santa Monica Mountains Conservancy and the National Park Service ; to the northwest by a landfill monitoring site; and to the south by a daycare facility, a religious school, and Highway 101. Natural biological resources consist of coastal sage scrub, non-native grassland, southern mixed riparian, coast live and valley oaks, and potential habitat for lyons pentachaeta, Catalina mariposa. Project site is undeveloped except for some on-site trails used for equestrian purposes; riding and grazing; and several empty horse trailers and dogs in kennels located in the southwest corner of the site.*

Zoning: *A-2-5; A-2-20; R-1-20; and R-1-5*

General Plan: *Non-urban; low density residential*

Community/Area wide Plan: *N5 ; N20 (Santa Monica Mountains North Area Plan)*

Major projects in area:

PROJECT NUMBER	DESCRIPTION & STATUS
CP98129	*To develop a technology center in C-M-DP (5/30/00 approved)*
TR43107	*58 SF, 1 OS & 1 Rec lot (inactive)*
TR49305	*1 MF/50 NC (10/1/91 approved)*
CP98062	*Heschel School (pending at RPC) – private school for 750 students*

NOTE: For EIRs, above projects are not sufficient for cumulative analysis.

REVIEWING AGENCIES

Responsible Agencies

- ☐ None
- ☒ Regional Water Quality Control Board
  - ☒ Los Angeles Region
  - ☐ Lahontan Region
- ☐ Coastal Commission
- ☒ Army Corps of Engineers
- ☒ *Caltrans*
- ☒ *U.S. Fish & Wildlife*
- ☐
- ☐
- ☐

Trustee Agencies

- ☐ None
- ☒ State Fish and Game
- ☒ State Parks
- ☐

Special Reviewing Agencies

- ☐ None
- ☒ Santa Monica Mountains Conservancy
- ☒ National Parks
- ☒ National Forest
- ☐ Edwards Air Force Base
- ☒ Resource Conservation District of Santa Monica Mtns. Area
- ☒ *City of Calabasas*
- ☒ *City of Agoura Hills*
- ☒ *Las Virgenes School District*
- ☒ *Las Virgenes Municipal Water District*
- ☒ *AQMD*
- ☒ *DTSC*
- ☐
- ☐
- ☐
- ☐

Regional Significance

- ☒ None
- ☐ SCAG Criteria
- ☐ Air Quality
- ☐ Water Resources
- ☐ Santa Monica Mtns. Area
- ☐
- ☐
- ☐
- ☐
- ☐
- ☐

County Reviewing Agencies

- ☒ Subdivision Committee
- ☒ DPW: *Drainage & Grading; Watershed Management; Land Development (NPDES review); Geotechnical & Materials Engineering Division; Traffic and Lighting; Environmental Program*
- ☒ Fire Department
- ☒ Health Services: *Environmental Hygiene*

IMPACT ANALYSIS MATRIX		ANALYSIS SUMMARY (See individual pages for details)				
			Less than Significant Impact/No Impact			
				Less than Significant Impact with Project Mitigation		
					Potentially Significant Impact	
CATEGORY	**FACTOR**	Pg				Potential Concern
HAZARDS	1. Geotechnical	5	☐	☐	☒	*Liquefaction, earthquake induced landslide*
	2. Flood	6	☐	☐	☒	*Alteration of drainage course, extensive grading*
	3. Fire	7	☐	☐	☒	*Fire Zone 4*
	4. Noise	8	☐	☒	☐	*Near Ventura Freeway*
RESOURCES	1. Water Quality	9	☐	☐	☒	*NPDES, water runoff*
	2. Air Quality	10	☐	☐	☒	*Approximately 800,000 c.y. grading*
	3. Biota	11	☐	☐	☒	*Oak trees, southern mixed riparian*
	4. Cultural Resources	12	☐	☐	☒	*Drainage course and oak trees*
	5. Mineral Resources	13	☒	☐	☐	
	6. Agriculture Resources	14	☒	☐	☐	
	7. Visual Qualities	15	☐	☐	☒	*Undisturbed area; Highway 101*
SERVICES	1. Traffic/Access	16	☐	☒	☐	*Access*
	2. Sewage Disposal	17	☐	☐	☒	*Potential capacity problem*
	3. Education	18	☐	☐	☒	*Potential school capacity problem*
	4. Fire/Sheriff	19	☐	☐	☒	*Potential staffing problem*
	5. Utilities	20	☐	☐	☒	*Potential capacity problem*
OTHER	1. General	21	☒	☐	☐	
	2. Environmental Safety	22	☐	☐	☒	*Adjacent to landfill*
	3. Land Use	23	☐	☐	☒	*Hillside development*
	4. Pop/Hous./Emp./Rec.	24	☒	☐	☐	
	5. Mandatory Findings	25	☐	☐	☒	*Biota, geotechnical, flood, education*

DEVELOPMENT MONITORING SYSTEM (DMS)

As required by the Los Angeles County General Plan, DMS* shall be employed in the Initial Study phase of the environmental review procedure as prescribed by state law.

1. Development Policy Map Designation: *Non-urban Hillside*
2. ☒ Yes ☐ No Is the project located in the Antelope Valley, East San Gabriel Valley, Malibu/Santa Monica Mountains or Santa Clarita Valley planning area?
3. ☐ Yes ☒ No Is the project at urban density and located within, or proposes a plan amendment to, an urban expansion designation?

If both of the above questions are answered "yes", the project is subject to a County DMS analysis.

☐ Check if DMS printout generated (attached)

Date of printout: _____

☐ Check if DMS overview worksheet completed (attached)

EIRs and/or staff reports shall utilize the most current DMS information available.

Environmental Finding:

FINAL DETERMINATION: On the basis of this Initial Study, the Department of Regional Planning finds that this project qualifies for the following environmental document:

☐ NEGATIVE DECLARATION, inasmuch as the proposed project will not have a significant effect on the environment.

An Initial Study was prepared on this project in compliance with the State CEQA Guidelines and the environmental reporting procedures of the County of Los Angeles. It was determined that this project will not exceed the established threshold criteria for any environmental/service factor and, as a result, will not have a significant effect on the physical environment.

☐ MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION, in as much as the changes required for the project will reduce impacts to insignificant levels (see attached discussion and/or conditions).

An Initial Study was prepared on this project in compliance with the State CEQA Guidelines and the environmental reporting procedures of the County of Los Angeles. It was originally determined that the proposed project may exceed established threshold criteria. The applicant has agreed to modification of the project so that it can now be determined that the project will not have a significant effect on the physical environment. The modification to mitigate this impact(s) is identified on the Project Changes/Conditions Form included as part of this Initial Study.

☒ ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT*, inasmuch as there is substantial evidence that the project may have a significant impact due to factors listed above as "significant".

☐ At least one factor has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to legal standards, and has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis as described on the attached sheets (see attached Form DRP/IA 101). The Addendum EIR is required to analyze only the factors changed or not previously addressed.

Reviewed by: Christina Tran Date: 12-14-04

Approved by: Daryl Koutnik Date: 13 DECEMBER 2004

☐ This proposed project is exempt from Fish and Game CEQA filling fees. There is no substantial evidence that the proposed project will have potential for an adverse effect on wildlife or the habitat upon which the wildlife depends. (Fish & Game Code 753.5).

☐ Determination appealed – see attached sheet.

*NOTE: Findings for Environmental Impact Reports will be prepared as a separate document following the public hearing on the project.

HAZARDS - 1. Geotechnical

SETTING/IMPACTS

	Yes	No	Maybe	
a.	☒	☐	☐	Is the project located in an active or potentially active fault zone, Seismic Hazards Zone, or Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone? *Liquefaction and earthquake induced landslides (Seismic Hazard Zones map – Calabasas quad)*
b.	☐	☐	☒	Is the project site located in an area containing a major landslide(s)? *5-100 acre bedrock landslides (Los Angeles County Safety Element Map)*
c.	☐	☐	☒	Is the project site located in an area having high slope instability? *Potential slope instability*
d.	☒	☐	☐	Is the project site subject to high subsidence, high groundwater level, liquefaction, or hydrocompaction? *Liquefaction (Seismic Hazard Zones map – Calabasas quad)*
e.	☐	☒	☐	Is the proposed project considered a sensitive use (school, hospital, public assembly site) located in close proximity to a significant geotechnical hazard?
f.	☒	☐	☐	Will the project entail substantial grading and/or alteration of topography including slopes of over 25%? *Approximately 800,000 c.y. of grading over slopes of over 25%*
g.	☐	☒	☐	Would the project be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property?
h.	☐	☐	☐	Other factors?

STANDARD CODE REQUIREMENTS

☐ Building Ordinance No. 2225 – Sections 308B, 309, 310, and 311 and Chapters 29 and 70

☒ **MITIGATION MEASURES**

☐ Lot Size ☐ Project Design

☐ **OTHER CONSIDERATIONS**

☒ Approval of Geotechnical Report by DPW

CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on, or be impacted by, **geotechnical** factors?

☒ Potentially significant ☐ Less than significant with project mitigation ☐ Less than significant/No Impact

HAZARDS - 2. Flood

SETTING/IMPACTS

	Yes	No	Maybe	
a.	☒	☐	☐	Is the major drainage course, as identified on USGS quad sheets by a dashed line, located on the project site? *Liberty Canyon drainage course to the west of the project site*
b.	☐	☐	☒	Is the project site located within or does it contain a floodway, floodplain, or designated flood hazard zone? *Drainage course on site*
c.	☐	☒	☐	Is the project site located in or subject to high mudflow conditions?
d.	☒	☐	☐	Could the project contribute or be subject to high erosion and debris deposition from run-off? *Due to extensive vegetation removal*
e.	☒	☐	☐	Would the project substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area? *Tributary drainages may be altered by paving and storm water runoff drainage structures*
f.	☐	☐	☐	Other factors (e.g., dam failure)?

STANDARD CODE REQUIREMENTS

☐ Building Ordinance No. 2225 – Section 308A ☐ Ordinance No. 12,114 (Floodways)

☒ Approval of Drainage Concept by DPW

☒ **MITIGATION MEASURES** ☐ **OTHER CONSIDERATIONS**

☐ Lot Size ☐ Project Design

CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on, or be impacted by **flood (hydrological)** factors?

☒ Potentially significant ☐ Less than significant with project mitigation ☐ Less than significant/No impact

HAZARDS - 3. Fire

SETTING/IMPACTS

	Yes	No	Maybe	
a.	☒	☐	☐	Is the project site located in a Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone (Fire Zone 4)?
b.	☐	☐	☒	Is the project site in a high fire hazard area and served by inadequate access due to lengths, width, surface materials, turnarounds or grade? *Proposed primary access will be connected to Canwood St. and secondary access to De Berry Dr.*
c.	☐	☒	☐	Does the project site have more than 75 dwelling units on a single access in a high fire hazard area?
d.	☐	☐	☒	Is the project site located in an area having inadequate water and pressure to meet fire flow standards? *Fire flows may require water tank*
e.	☒	☐	☐	Is the project located in close proximity to potential dangerous fire hazard conditions/uses (such as refineries, flammables, explosives manufacturing)? *Calabasas landfill to the north – methane gas production*
f.	☐	☒	☐	Does the proposed use constitute a potentially dangerous fire hazard?
g.	☐	☐	☐	Other factors?

STANDARD CODE REQUIREMENTS

☒ Water Ordinance No. 7834 ☒ Fire Ordinance No. 2947 ☒ Fire Regulation No. 8
☒ Fuel Modification / Landscape Plan

☐ **MITIGATION MEASURES** ☐ **OTHER CONSIDERATIONS**

☐ Project Design ☐ Compatible Use

CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on, or be impacted by **fire hazard** factors?

☒ Potentially significant ☐ Less than significant with project mitigation ☐ Less than significant/No impact

HAZARDS - 4. Noise

SETTING/IMPACTS

	Yes	No	Maybe	
a.	☒	☐	☐	Is the project site located near a high noise source (airports, railroads, freeways, industry)?
				101 Freeway to the south and Calabasas Sanitary Landfill operations to the north
b.	☐	☐	☒	Is the proposed use considered sensitive (school, hospital, senior citizen facility) or are there other sensitive uses in close proximity?
				Daycare facility and a religious school to the south of project site
c.	☐	☒	☐	Could the project substantially increase ambient noise levels including those associated with special equipment (such as amplified sound systems) or parking areas associated with the project?
d.	☐	☒	☐	Would the project result in a substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels without the project?
				Construction noise
e.	☐	☐	☐	Other factors?

STANDARD CODE REQUIREMENTS

☒ Noise Control (Title 12 – Chapter 8) ☐ Uniform Building Code (Title 26 - Chapter 35)

☒ MITIGATION MEASURES ☐ OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

☐ Lot Size ☐ Project Design ☐ Compatible Use

Topographical features between proposed residences and 101 Freeway

CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on, or be adversely impacted by **noise**?

☐ Potentially significant ☒ Less than significant with project mitigation ☐ Less than significant/No impact

RESOURCES - 1. Water Quality

SETTING/IMPACTS

	Yes	No	Maybe	
a.	☐	☒	☐	Is the project site located in an area having known water quality problems and proposing the use of individual water wells? *Las Virgenes Municipal Water District*
b.	☐	☒	☐	Will the proposed project require the use of a private sewage disposal system? *Las Virgenes Municipal Water District*
	☐	☐	☐	If the answer is yes, is the project site located in an area having known septic tank limitations due to high groundwater or other geotechnical limitations *or* is the project proposing on-site systems located in close proximity to a drainage course?
c.	☒	☐	☐	Could the project's associated construction activities significantly impact the quality of groundwater and/or storm water runoff to the storm water conveyance system and/or receiving water bodies? *10-99 home subdivisions are subject to NPDES requirements*
d.	☒	☐	☐	Could the project's post-development activities potentially degrade the quality of storm water runoff and/or could post-development non-storm water discharges contribute potential pollutants to the storm water conveyance system and/or receiving bodies? *10-99 home subdivisions are subject to NPDES requirements*
e.	☐	☐	☐	Other factors?

STANDARD CODE REQUIREMENTS

☐ Industrial Waste Permit
☐ Plumbing Code – Ordinance No.2269
☐ Health Code – Ordinance No.7583, Chapter 5
☒ NPDES Permit Compliance (DPW)

☐ **MITIGATION MEASURES**
☐ Lot Size ☐ Project Design ☐ Compatible Use

☐ **OTHER CONSIDERATIONS**

CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on, or be adversely impacted by, **water quality** problems?

☒ Potentially significant ☐ Less than significant with project mitigation ☐ Less than significant/No impact

RESOURCES - 2. Air Quality

SETTING/IMPACTS

	Yes	No	Maybe	
a.	☐	☒	☐	Will the proposed project exceed the State's criteria for regional significance (generally (a) 500 dwelling units for residential users or (b) 40 gross acres, 650,000 square feet of floor area or 1,000 employees for non-residential uses)?
b.	☐	☒	☐	Is the proposal considered a sensitive use (schools, hospitals, parks) and located near a freeway or heavy industrial use?
c.	☐	☒	☐	Will the project increase local emissions to a significant extent due to increased traffic congestion or use of a parking structure or exceed AQMD thresholds of potential significance per Screening Tables of the CEQA Air Quality Handbook?
d.	☐	☐	☒	Will the project generate or is the site in close proximity to sources that create obnoxious odors, dust, and/or hazardous emissions? *Landfill to the north*
e.	☐	☒	☐	Would the project conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?
f.	☐	☐	☒	Would the project violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation? *800,000 c.y. of grading – PM10*
g.	☐	☐	☒	Would the project result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emission which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)? *Air basin is non-attainment area*
h.	☐	☐	☐	Other factors?

STANDARD CODE REQUIREMENTS

☐ Health and Safety Code – Section 40506

☐ **MITIGATION MEASURES**

☐ Project Design ☒ Air Quality Report

☐ **OTHER CONSIDERATIONS**

CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on, or be adversely impacted by, **air quality**?

☒ Potentially significant ☐ Less than significant with project mitigation ☐ Less than significant/No impact

RESOURCES - 3. Biota

SETTING/IMPACTS

	Yes	No	Maybe	
a.	☒	☐	☐	Is the project site located within Significant Ecological Area (SEA), SEA Buffer, or coastal Sensitive Environmental Resource (ESHA, etc.), or is the site relatively undisturbed and natural?
				Site is relatively undisturbed and natural; SEA 12 is located north of site
b.	☒	☐	☐	Will grading, fire clearance, or flood related improvements remove substantial natural habitat areas?
				Coastal sage scrub, non-native grassland – 53 acres of disturbance
c.	☒	☐	☐	Is a major drainage course, as identified on USGS quad sheets by a blue dashed line, located on the project site?
				Liberty Canyon drainage course to west of site
d.	☒	☐	☐	Does the project site contain a major riparian or other sensitive habitat (e.g. coastal sage scrub, oak woodland, sycamore riparian, woodland, wetland, etc.)?
				Southern mixed riparian, coastal sage scrub
e.	☒	☐	☐	Does the project site contain oak or other unique native trees (specify kinds of trees)?
				Coastal live oaks and valley oaks
f.	☐	☐	☒	Is the project site habitat for any known sensitive species (federal or state listed endangered, etc.)?
				Lyons pentachaeta, Catalina mariposa
g.	☒	☐	☐	Other factors (e.g., wildlife corridor, adjacent open space linkage)?
				Adjacent to open space linkage and wildlife corridor to the west

☐ **MITIGATION MEASURES**

☐ Lot Size ☐ Project Design

☐ **OTHER CONSIDERATIONS**

☐ ERB/SEATAC Review ☒ Oak Tree Permit

CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on, **biotic** resources?

☒ Potentially significant ☐ Less than significant with project mitigation ☐ Less than significant/No impact

RESOURCES - 4. Archaeological/Historical/Paleontological

SETTING/IMPACTS

	Yes	No	Maybe	
a.	☒	☐	☐	Is the project site in or near an area containing known archaeological resources or containing features (drainage course, spring, knoll, rock outcroppings, or oak trees) that indicate potential archaeological sensitivity? *Drainage course and oak trees; 13 sites within 1 mile radius of project site; 1998 cultural survey completed by (McKenna et al) indicated there is the potential for buried deposits on the project site*
b.	☐	☒	☐	Does the project site contain rock formations indicating potential paleontological resources?
c.	☒	☐	☐	Does the project site contain known historic structures or sites? *South portion of the property "Rancho Pet Kennels"*
d.	☐	☒	☐	Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical or archaeological resource as defined in 15064.5?
e.	☐	☒	☐	Would the project directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?
f.	☐	☐	☐	Other factors?

☐ **MITIGATION MEASURES** ☐ **OTHER CONSIDERATIONS**

☐ Lot Size ☐ Project Design ☒ Phase 1 Archaeology Report

CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project leave a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on **archaeological, historical**, or **paleontological** resources?

☒ Potentially significant ☐ Less than significant with project mitigation ☐ Less than significant/No impact

RESOURCES - 5. Mineral Resources

SETTING/IMPACTS

	Yes	No	Maybe	
a.	☐	☒	☐	Would the project result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?
b.	☐	☒	☐	Would the project result in the loss of availability of a locally important mineral resource discovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?
c.	☐	☐	☐	Other factors?

☐ **MITIGATION MEASURES** ☐ **OTHER CONSIDERATIONS**

☐ Lot Size ☐ Project Design

CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project leave a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on **mineral** resources?

☐ Potentially significant ☐ Less than significant with project mitigation ☒ Less than significant/No impact

RESOURCES - 6. Agriculture Resources

SETTING/IMPACTS

	Yes	No	Maybe	
a.	☐	☒	☐	Would the project convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency to non-agricultural use?
b.	☐	☒	☐	Would the project conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?
c.	☐	☒	☐	Would the project involve other changes in the existing environment that due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use?
d.	☐	☐	☐	Other factors?

☐ **MITIGATION MEASURES** ☐ **OTHER CONSIDERATIONS**

☐ Lot Size ☐ Project Design

CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project leave a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on **agriculture** resources?

☐ Potentially significant ☐ Less than significant with project mitigation ☒ Less than significant/No impact

RESOURCES - 7. Visual Qualities

SETTING/IMPACTS

	Yes	No	Maybe	
a.	☒	☐	☐	Is the project site substantially visible from or will it obstruct views along a scenic highway (as shown on the Scenic Highway Element), or is it located within a scenic corridor or will it otherwise impact the viewshed?
				Ventura Freeway is a scenic corridor
b.	☐	☒	☐	Is the project substantially visible from or will it obstruct views from a regional riding or hiking trail?
c.	☐	☒	☐	Is the project site located in an undeveloped or undisturbed area that contains unique aesthetic features?
d.	☐	☐	☒	Is the proposed use out-of-character in comparison to adjacent uses because of height, bulk, or other features?
				Project site is an undisturbed area adjacent to Saratoga Hills residential development
e.	☐	☒	☐	Is the project likely to create substantial sun shadow, light or glare problems?
f.	☒	☐	☐	Other factors (e.g., grading or landform alteration)?
				Extensive grading and landform alteration

☐ **MITIGATION MEASURES** ☐ **OTHER CONSIDERATIONS**

☐ Lot Size ☐ Project Design ☐ Visual Report ☐ Compatible Use

CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project leave a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on **scenic** qualities?

☒ Potentially significant ☐ Less than significant with project mitigation ☐ Less than significant/No impact

SERVICES - 1. Traffic/Access

SETTING/IMPACTS

	Yes	No	Maybe	
a.	☐	☐	☒	Does the project contain 25 dwelling units or more and is it located in an area with known congestion problems (roadway or intersections)? *Highway 101 is congested*
b.	☐	☒	☐	Will the project result in any hazardous traffic conditions?
c.	☐	☒	☐	Will the project result in parking problems with a subsequent impact on traffic conditions?
d.	☐	☐	☒	Will inadequate access during an emergency (other than fire hazards) result in problems for emergency vehicles or residents/employees in the area? *Access will be connected to Canwood St. and De Berry Dr.*
e.	☐	☒	☐	Will the congestion management program (CMP) Transportation Impact Analysis thresholds of 50 peak hour vehicles added by project traffic to a CMP highway system intersection or 150 peak hour trips added by project traffic to a mainline freeway link be exceeded?
f.	☐	☒	☐	Would the project conflict with adopted policies, plans, or program supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus, turnouts, bicycle racks)?
g.	☐	☐	☐	Other factors?

☒ **MITIGATION MEASURES** ☐ **OTHER CONSIDERATIONS**

☐ Project Design ☐ Traffic Report ☒ Consultation with Traffic & Lighting Division

CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project leave a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on **traffic/access** factors?

☐ Potentially significant ☒ Less than significant with project mitigation ☐ Less than significant/No impact

SERVICES - 2. Sewage Disposal

SETTING/IMPACTS

	Yes	No	Maybe	
a.	☐	☐	☒	If served by a community sewage system, could the project create capacity problems at the treatment plant?
				23 new housing development
b.	☐	☐	☒	Could the project create capacity problems in the sewer lines serving the project site?
				23 new housing development
c.	☐	☐	☐	Other factors?

STANDARD CODE REQUIREMENTS

☐ Sanitary Sewers and Industrial Waste – Ordinance No. 6130

☐ Plumbing Code – Ordinance No. 2269

☐ **MITIGATION MEASURES** ☐ **OTHER CONSIDERATIONS**

CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on the physical environment due to **sewage disposal** facilities?

☒ Potentially significant ☐ Less than significant with project mitigation ☐ Less than significant/No impact

SERVICES - 3. Education

SETTING/IMPACTS

	Yes	No	Maybe	
a.	☒	☐	☐	Could the project create capacity problems at the district level? *Schools are currently operating over capacity*
b.	☒	☐	☐	Could the project create capacity problems at individual schools that will serve the project site? *Schools are currently operating over capacity*
c.	☐	☒	☐	Could the project create student transportation problems?
d.	☐	☐	☒	Could the project create substantial library impacts due to increased population and demand? *Library volumes and potential space shortage*
e.	☐	☐	☐	Other factors?

☐ **MITIGATION MEASURES** ☐ **OTHER CONSIDERATIONS**

☐ Site Dedication ☒ Government Code Section 65995 ☒ Library Facilities Mitigation Fee

CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) relative to **educational** facilities/services?

☒ Potentially significant ☐ Less than significant with project mitigation ☐ Less than significant/No impact

SERVICES - 4. Fire/Sheriff Services

SETTING/IMPACTS

	Yes	No	Maybe	
a.	☐	☐	☒	Could the project create staffing or response time problems at the fire station or sheriff's substation serving the project site?
				Staffing requirement – Fire Station 125 at 2515 N. Las Virgenes Road
b.	☐	☒	☐	Are there any special fire or law enforcement problems associated with the project or the general area?
				Lost Hills sheriff station located at 27050 Agoura Road
c.	☐	☐	☐	Other factors?

☐ **MITIGATION MEASURES**

☒ Fire Mitigation Fee

☐ **OTHER CONSIDERATIONS**

CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) relative to **fire/sheriff** services?

☒ Potentially significant ☐ Less than significant with project mitigation ☐ Less than significant/No impact

SERVICES - 5. Utilities/Other Services

SETTING/IMPACTS

	Yes	No	Maybe	
a.	☐	☒	☐	Is the project site in an area known to have an inadequate public water supply to meet domestic needs or to have an inadequate ground water supply and proposes water wells?
b.	☐	☒	☐	Is the project site in an area known to have an inadequate water supply and/or pressure to meet fire fighting needs?
c.	☐	☒	☐	Could the project create problems with providing utility services, such as electricity, gas, or propane?
d.	☐	☐	☒	Are there any other known service problem areas (e.g., solid waste)? *Calabasas Landfill is near full capacity*
e.	☐	☐	☒	Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services or facilities (e.g., fire protection, police protection, schools, parks, roads)? *Fire protection, schools*
f.	☐	☐	☐	Other factors?

STANDARD CODE REQUIREMENTS

☐ Plumbing Code – Ordinance No. 2269 ☐ Water Code – Ordinance No. 7834

☐ **MITIGATION MEASURES** ☐ **OTHER CONSIDERATIONS**

☐ Lot Size ☐ Project Design

CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) relative to **utilities** services?

☒ Potentially significant ☐ Less than significant with project mitigation ☐ Less than significant/No impact

OTHER FACTORS - 1. General

SETTING/IMPACTS

	Yes	No	Maybe	
a.	☐	☒	☐	Will the project result in an inefficient use of energy resources?
b.	☐	☒	☐	Will the project result in a major change in the patterns, scale, or character of the general area or community?
c.	☐	☒	☐	Will the project result in a significant reduction in the amount of agricultural land?
d.	☐	☐	☐	Other factors?

STANDARD CODE REQUIREMENTS

☐ State Administrative Code, Title 24, Part 5, T-20 (Energy Conservation)

☐ **MITIGATION MEASURES** ☐ **OTHER CONSIDERATIONS**

☐ Lot Size ☐ Project Design ☐ Compatible Use

CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on the physical environment due to any of the above factors?

☐ Potentially significant ☐ Less than significant with project mitigation ☒ Less than significant/No impact

OTHER FACTORS - 2. Environmental Safety

SETTING/IMPACTS

	Yes	No	Maybe	
a.	☐	☒	☐	Are any hazardous materials used, transported, produced, handled, or stored on-site?
b.	☐	☒	☐	Are any pressurized tanks to be used or any hazardous wastes stored on-site?
c.	☐	☐	☒	Are any residential units, schools, or hospitals located within 500 feet and potentially adversely affected? *Religious school to south*
d.	☒	☐	☐	Have there been previous uses that indicate residual soil toxicity of the site or is the site located within two miles downstream of a known groundwater contamination source within the same watershed? *Project is down stream of landfill*
e.	☐	☒	☐	Would the project create a significant hazard to the public or the environment involving the accidental release of hazardous materials into the environment?
f.	☐	☒	☐	Would the project emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?
g.	☐	☒	☐	Would the project be located on a site that is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would create a significant hazard to the public or environment?
h.	☐	☒	☐	Would the project result in a safety hazard for people in a project area located within an airport land use plan, within two miles of a public or public use airport, or within the vicinity of a private airstrip?
i.	☐	☒	☐	Would the project impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?
j.	☐	☐	☐	Other factors?

☐ **MITIGATION MEASURES**
☐ Toxic Clean-up Plan

☐ **OTHER CONSIDERATIONS**

CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact relative to **public safety**?

☒ Potentially significant ☐ Less than significant with project mitigation ☐ Less than significant/No impact

OTHER FACTORS - 3. Land Use

SETTING/IMPACTS

	Yes	No	Maybe	
a.	☐	☒	☐	Can the project be found to be inconsistent with the plan designation(s) of the subject property?
b.	☐	☒	☐	Can the project be found to be inconsistent with the zoning designation of the subject property?
c.				Can the project be found to be inconsistent with the following applicable land use criteria:
	☐	☐	☒	Hillside Management Criteria?
	☐	☒	☐	SEA Conformance Criteria?
	☐	☐	☐	Other?
d.	☐	☒	☐	Would the project physically divide an established community?
e.	☐	☐	☐	Other factors?

☐ **MITIGATION MEASURES** ☐ **OTHER CONSIDERATIONS**

CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on the physical environment due to **land use** factors?

☒ Potentially significant ☐ Less than significant with project mitigation ☐ Less than significant/No impact

OTHER FACTORS - 4. Population/Housing/Employment/Recreation

SETTING/IMPACTS

	Yes	No	Maybe	
a.	☐	☒	☐	Could the project cumulatively exceed official regional or local population projections?
b.	☐	☒	☐	Could the project induce substantial direct or indirect growth in an area (e.g., through projects in an undeveloped area or extension of major infrastructure)?
c.	☐	☒	☐	Could the project displace existing housing, especially affordable housing?
d.	☐	☒	☐	Could the project result in substantial job/housing imbalance or substantial increase in Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT)?
e.	☐	☒	☐	Could the project require new or expanded recreational facilities for future residents?
f.	☐	☒	☐	Would the project displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?
g.	☐	☐	☐	Other factors?

☐ **MITIGATION MEASURES** ☐ **OTHER CONSIDERATIONS**

CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on the physical environment due to **population, housing, employment,** or **recreational** factors?

☐ Potentially significant ☐ Less than significant with project mitigation ☒ Less than significant/No impact

MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE

Based on this Initial Study, the following findings are made:

	Yes	No	Maybe	
a.	☒	☐	☐	Does the project have the potential to substantially degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal, or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory? *Biota*
b.	☒	☐	☐	Does the project have possible environmental effects that are individually limited but cumulatively considerable? "Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of an individual project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects. *Fire protection, school, visual*
c.	☒	☐	☐	Will the environmental effects of the project cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly? *Water quality, geotechnical, flood, air quality*

CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on the environment?

☒ Potentially significant ☐ Less than significant with project mitigation ☐ Less than significant/No impact